

National Forest Advisory Board (NFAB) Meeting

May 15, 2013

Mystic Ranger District

Members Present:

Chairman Jim Scherrer, Colin Paterson, Tom Blair, Hugh Thompson, Mike Verchio, Bill Kohlbrand, Bob Burns, Doug Hofer, Dan Hutt, Steve Sisk, Craig Tieszen, Terry Mayes, Sam Brannan, Ev Hoyt, Nels Smith, Jim Heinert, Lon Carrier, Bob Paulson, Suzanne Iudicello-Martley, Jeff Vonk, Dave Brenneisen

Members Absent:

Becci Flanders-Paterson, Donovin Sprague, Dick Brown, Richard Krull

Round Robin ~ Reflections on the First Ten Years:

- Getting to know the people/colleagues on the Board.
- Getting to know the Forest Service.
- Respect for the employees on the Black Hills.
- Travel Management Plan; Motorized Trail System.
- Mountain Pine Beetle Response Project EIS.
- Being Chairman.
- Been an education regarding issues, the Forest, etc.
- Environmentalism; about a place that we love and the BH is a place we live.
- Encouraged by the people in this room; Forest Service, Committee members, people with a purpose. Discouraged by the process under which the people have to work; the countless regulations.
- Civility with which this has been handled; civil give and take.
- People coming together with people of different points of view.
- Stagebarn/Botany Canyon; NFAB meeting helped the communication; example of cutting the red tape, doing the right thing, with the cooperation of the Leadership of the user groups.
- Norbeck Society developed as a result of the NFAB organization.
- Appreciate the opportunity to serve.
- Travel to Denver to work with wildland urban interface.
- Hope that land exchanges will continue.
- This group has hung together, and persevered; and our voices have been heard.
- This Island in the Plains is a very special place; diverse ecology.
- We've made a contribution to the preservation of the Black Hills.
- Friends, education, people.
- The Forest Service has been better at disseminating advice than taking it.
- Compromise, optimism
- This is not just for showing up for cookies and coffee; we come in here to be educated.
- Quality, knowledgeable people.
- Environmentalist, Miner, and a Lawyer; working together on the MPB issue.
- Best managed Forest in the nation.
- Recognize and appreciate the past; your best conservationist and environmentalist are the

ranchers, farmers, miners, etc.

- If you're feeling scenically, overwhelmed; get off the Board – stay optimistic.
- Bob Thompson was here before anyone else was on the Board; want to recognize Bob as a major role model and leader.
- The years with this Board have taught me a lot.
- There are the absolute two extremes as far as members on this Board.
- Everyone in the room has a love and passion for the Black Hills; each of us has a little part of that success.
- Cooperation at all levels; this is one of only two Forest's in the Nation that has a National Forest Advisory Board.
- Good communication between State & Federal leaders.
- Happy to have had the frustration.
- Intellectual and philosophical integrity; even the things we didn't accomplish we resolved to continue.

Forest Service Representatives:

Dennis Jaeger, Steve Kozel, Craig Bobzien, Lynn Kolund, Julie Wheeler, Ruth Esperance, Craig Beckner, Ralph Adam, Kerry Burns, Scott Jacobson, Marie Curtin, Dave Mertz, and Twila Morris

Others:

Approximately 10 members of the public were in attendance. Four Congressional representatives were also in attendance; Kyle Holt (Noem – R, South Dakota), Chris Blair (Johnson – D, South Dakota), Mark Haugen (Thune – R, South Dakota), and DeAnna Kay-Bruski (Enzi – R, Wyoming).

Introduction & Welcome:

Scherrer: It is 1:30 p.m. and we have a quorum, let's get started.

Approve the Minutes:

Scherrer: Our first item of business is to approve the minutes from the March meeting. The minutes were distributed, comments received and incorporated. Does anyone have any comments or changes to the minutes?

Can I have a motion to approve the Minutes? Motion made by Hugh Thompson second by Lon Carrier. All in favor of approving the minutes as they read say aye; opposed same sign. The minutes are approved.

Approve the Agenda:

Scherrer: Next item of business is to approve the agenda. Do I have a motion to approve the Agenda? Motion made by Craig Tieszen second by Tom Blair. Is there any discussion? All in favor of approving the agenda as it reads say aye; opposed same sign. The Agenda is approved.

Housekeeping:

DFO Jaeger: Welcome to our guests and Board members. In case of an emergency, the main exit is to the front where you came in; there is another exit down the hall in the back and out to the back parking lot; restrooms to the front and back as well and refreshments on the table in the back.

Comment to the Chair

DFO Jaeger: Thank you to the Board members for your work. If you just take one example of a project that you've worked on, the motorized travel project; you all have done a tremendous amount of work. In a very short period of time, we have made major progress. We are a better place because of your efforts.

Also, today is Lynn Kolund's last meeting; Lynn will be retiring the first of June. Let's give a round of applause to Lynn.

Meeting Protocols:

Scherrer: Once again, I would ask that cell phones be put on silent. For those in the audience, we have 15 minutes scheduled for public comments at the end of the meeting. Public comments will only be taken if there is time. I value your time here today. Folks in the audience are welcome to forward your comments to the Board member that represents you prior to a meeting so that your concerns may be addressed.

Hot Topics

Legislative Updates - Federal

Scherrer: Routinely we have the three Congressional delegation folks from SD at our meetings and we invite the Wyoming delegation; today DeAnna Kay-Bruski from Senator Enzi's office has joined us. Thank you for coming DeAnna. We ask each representative to give us an update on issues related to the Forest Service. Keep in mind that we ask that you keep it to three minutes; thank you. DeAnna would you like to speak first?

Kay-Bruski: Senator Enzi has joined Senator Barrasso in the Good Neighbor Bill. That Bill would allow the Forest Service to treat infested trees on neighboring properties.

Scherrer: Any questions for DeAnna? If not, we'll go to Kyle Holt of Representative Noem's

office next.

Kyle Holt: Kristi sits on the Farm Bill Committee; they are working on making that a five year Bill. The House did just pass the Black Hills (BH) Cemetery Bill. Kristi is co-sponsoring the Healthy Forest Restoration Act bill; this would ensure that the Forest Service (FS) did not spend any money purchasing new land in the next five years, but would spend the money as an investment back in to the current FS property.

Scherrer: Thank you Kyle, does anyone have any questions for Kyle? If not, we'll go to Mark Haugen of Senator Thune's office next.

Mark Haugen: Good afternoon. The Senator was out to the Black Hills a couple of weeks ago and spoke to the Back Country Horseman Group. John had to follow Craig, so he had his work cut out for him. The Senate is addressing the Farm Bill as well. They are going off the template from last year with the addition of another 100 additions. The Sod Saver provision of Thune's amendment survived. This provision would make sure that farmers were not penalized for turning up native sod. The Forestry Titles improvements have survived as well, and we are hoping there will be a vote to get it out of the Senate by the end of the month. Prioritizing forest management over forest acquisition; letter of request for them to consider; the Federal Government owns a third of the land in the US, and we would like the money to be used for investing back into currently owned property. Wind Cave National Park has found a way to keep the Elk Mountain Campground open for the summer.

Scherrer: Thank you Mark, are there any questions for Mark? If not, we'll move on to Chris Blair of Senator Johnson's office.

Chris Blair: I appreciate everyone on this Board and value your opinion. I take your advice back to the Senator. Thanks to all of you who have served. As was mentioned, the Farm Bill was passed out of committee and is now headed to the floor. I was encouraged that it only took three hours to mark up the Senate version of the Farm Bill. The Energy Committee will be marking up the Cemetery Bill Tuesday. At a meeting last month, Chief Tidwell was before the Committee regarding budget. Johnson has joined with Thune in the Good Neighbor bill. The Senator is also involved in a joint letter to encourage the FS to use the retired C27J aircraft to fight forest fires.

Scherrer: Thank you Chris, does anyone have any questions?

Brannan: Just a comment; Chris please pass on to Senator Johnson our thanks for all of his work. I know that he is on his way out as I am, so this will be my last chance to express my thanks. And thank you and all of the elected officials for all you do because I would never do that!

Scherrer: Thank you Sam. We'll move on now to our State Legislative updates. We'll start with Senator Tieszen.

Tieszen: There is not a whole lot to report, as you now the Legislative session adjourned in

March. A lot of us are busy with summer committees, there is a lot work being done in the off session. I'll be leaving at 4:00 today to meet with the West River Tour of the legislative group; this is valuable trip for Legislators that allows them to get their eyes on our forest. In the last couple of years, with the MBP legislation etc., the support that the FS has state wide is really solid. You might think we have to fight our partners in the east, but that's not the case. There are 20 Legislators out here right now looking at issues in the Black Hills.

Verchio: I would like to recognize our Chairman (Jim Scherrer) for the outstanding job he did speaking to this Legislative group last night. The recap he did of the issues here was fantastic for getting the point across in showing the extent and severity of the pine beetle problem in the Black Hills. Jim did an outstanding job, thank you.

Scherrer: Thanks Mike. As a follow up, I would like to take a second to share one thing. This is the House and the Senate Ag and Natural Resources Committee that are touring the Hills. They asked me to speak to represent private landowners, and I was able to hammer home the fact that this is a statewide issue. This is South Dakota and we need to lock arms, and just because some areas have claimed to go from epidemic to endemic; that's not to say that we don't all have work to do. Anything you guys can do from your expertise and perspective will help us all. Thanks for attending that meeting Mike.

Jaeger: I would like to comment on the Rapid City Journal article in yesterday's paper that said the FS Forest Plan Amendment decision had been upheld. This was the litigation against our Phase Two Forest Plan amendment. Last fall a decision was made that upheld the amendment; the appellants then filed to have the judge reconsider. He relooked, and upheld his decision again. It can now be appealed in Federal court in Denver. Forest Service supporters and interveners were the Black Hills Forest Resource Association and the states of Wyoming and South Dakota.

Scherrer: I apologize for the slight to Hugh Thompson, I'm sorry my friend. Do you have an update?

Thompson: DeAnna, I am pleased that you are here, and I'm glad you are back with us. I applaud you for your efforts for bringing the Good Neighbor legislation to the State of Wyoming. The states need this legislation, particularly when private land owners are working on their land, and there are trees that need to be treated on Federal land. DeAnna; the other thing you could help us with is the mineral royalty funds. The administration has withheld millions of dollars under the guise of sequestration. We got a million dollars and the rest was contingent on what kind of a fire season we had in the state of Wyoming.

Kay-Bruski: They are working on a Bill to help the states with the mineral royalties. I do not have a status of that bill.

Smith: As more of an Executive action than Legislative action in Wyoming; a direct take off of, Governor Meade just released his Energy Policy – through what I believe were specific, sincere efforts to do the right thing – it's the kind of work that groups like this can do. Unless they find something of an energy nature in the BH, this won't affect us here.

Regular Agenda

Travel Management ~ Board Recommendation on CY 2014 Permit Fees ~ Ralph Adam

Scherrer: Our first item on the regular agenda is the Travel Management (TM) recommendation by the Board for CY 2014 permit fees. We were going to address this at the April meeting, and as part of the decision to cancel the April meeting, I was told that it would give the FS adequate time if we came together in May with the discussion.

The question today for this Board, acting as the Resource Advisory Committee is: Does the Recreation Resource Advisory Committee recommend any changes to the fee structure for the 2014 season and if so, how?

We've had dialog, questions, data, etc. to the extent the FS has information. Ralph Adam made a second presentation at the February meeting. Ralph presented the one particular slide of substance that reads:

Recommendation:

- The Black Hills National Forest recommendation is to sustain the current levels of Motorized Trail Permit fees for calendar year 2014, which are:
 - \$20 7-Day Permit
 - \$25 Annual Permit
 - \$125 Commercial Permit

Ralph also provided us with additional data, and after that meeting there was a subsequent meeting in an unofficial capacity with Ralph, Dennis, Steve and a couple of us Board members, to have dialog about this issue. We spent time asking questions. We have had two agenda items, two presentations, two opportunities for discussion and now we are at the point of needing to move forward with our recommendation for the FS.

So the recommendation is to sustain the current levels of Motorized Trail Permit fees for calendar year 2014. I am looking for a motion to accept or reject the recommendation.

Thompson: I move that we do accept the recommendation with an amendment or caveat. This is a chance for the FS to take a little advice. In past meetings Sam brought up the possibility of the potential to do a life time permit. To streamline the process; the dealer might even throw in the permit; set the price high enough so as to not lose money. I believe the FS should examine this option along with the recommendation.

Scherrer: Hugh has made a motion to accept the recommendation with the caveat that the FS look at additional data as it is available from this Board prior to January 2014. Would that wording be OK with you Hugh?

Thompson: I would be OK with that because January 2014 isn't that far off, but I think they should consider it and come back to the Board with their findings.

Scherrer: Hugh, would you word your motion one more time please?

Thompson: I make a motion to accept the recommendation of the FS with the caveat that the FS

examine additional possibilities and report back to this Board.

Kohlbrand: I second the motion.

Scherrer: We have a motion and a second on the table. Is there any discussion?

Blair: We've been stuck now basically where we were several years ago. One of the problems I have is that I'm tired of kicking the can down the road, because that is realistically what we are doing. We lose money thru inflation and a variety of other things, you can take this as a recommendation or not – but we are caught in a Catch 22; we started looking at this and comparing it to the State GF&P snowmobile program. It's run well because it's run with good management and good money. The snowmobile program gets a gas tax and a sticker fee. Governor Rounds told us we would not get a gas tax. We also have thousands of ATVs that have license plates that allow them to ride on hard surfaced roads, etc. My suggestion to the FS is to take a good hard look; the ATV user can ride on a hard surface road in the BH, if the FS is responsible for signage, education, and maintenance on non-hard surface roads, then those people should also have a sticker. The ATV groups have no problem with this. If we are going to move forward, with money and more trails, then we need to take a look at doing that because we will never ever move forward if we don't. The state may not ever change the way they license ATVs.

Scherrer: In order to keep this clear; we are asked to approve or reject the FS recommendation. I hear what you are saying Tom. In order to provide a take home message, could you reword in the form of an amendment? We will be talking about this in January of 2014. All of these points that you guys are making, could all be in the recommendation that could again, give them what they need for 2014.

Iudicello-Martley: Point of order; we are being presented with an “accept or reject” recommendation. I support Hugh's purpose behind the extra verbiage. But I think we need to reject the recommendation, because we clearly have a lot of other ideas. If we accept the recommendation, with the caveat that the FS bring us more information, we know what that will end up like because it has not been easy getting information back from the FS on this topic. I don't want to speak against the motion but I do want to speak against the procedure. I think we need to reject it and propose another motion; otherwise it is kicking the can down the road.

Paterson: Do we have a second to the motion?

Scherrer: The motion was made by Hugh. I'm trying to keep this motion as simple as possible; time is short, we either give them approval or reject it. If we reject it, then we will essentially be sending them the message that we will not give them guidance as to what to do; because as the RAC we have the responsibility to guide the FS on this issue.

Paterson: I agree with Hugh and Suzanne, we need to keep it simple.

Vonk: It seems to me that there is nothing that prevents this Board from accepting the motion then making a second substitute motion; or ask Hugh, if it would be a friendly movement to recommend a second motion.

Smith: If I understood the motion, it accepts the recommendation, but directs the FS to provide

additional information.

Vonk: By muddying up the recommendation, some folks might vote no on it rather than keeping it clear with a simple accepts, and a secondary motion for more information.

Thompson: The motion doesn't affect the fee schedule at this point, but I would be ok to take the amendment off; as long as we make another motion for follow up.

Scherrer: If the original motion maker allows that to take place, as the Chair, I will entertain a follow up motion, is that a clear way to say it Hugh?

Thompson: I withdraw the caveat and make the motion to accept the recommendation.

Scherrer: I move to accept the motion as outlined by Hugh.

Paterson: I'm going to take some time on this; so I have a question for Dennis or Craig. My question is: Does the FS have enough funds to do what you need to do on the BHNF? Not just with the motorized trail program, but do you have enough funds to do what you need to do to operate on the BHNF?

Jaeger: No, we do not have enough funds to do what we need to do on the Black Hills National Forest.

Paterson: Ralph talked to us about the cost per permit sold. The cost was: \$112.46 in 2011; \$76.03 in 2012; and \$61.61 in 2013. What that is saying is that there is not enough money coming in to operate the system. I quote from the 2008 Plan: The reason for the new fees... "Implementing the Travel Management Plan, especially in the South Dakota portion of the Forest, requires a consistent funding source to accommodate the trail use in an environmentally sound and financially sustainable manner. The new motorized trail user fee will be the predominant funding source to cover these expenses. Without this fee, the new motorized trail system cannot be implemented fully or sustained for the long term".

Clearly the system is not fiscally sustainable. We heard from an employee about the condition of the trail system, was it standing up to the use, and he said no – it was being degraded; it was not standing up to the use, it was not being taken care of. To keep the fees at the status quo is quite wrong. It's not fiscally sustainable, and it doesn't allow the FS to do what they need to do. If we raise the fees, it would get us closer to being sustainable. We could compare it to the Mickelson Trail, which is 110 miles and the permit is \$15.00. Currently you get 570 miles of motorized trails for \$25.00. The cost to build and maintain the motorized system is much more. We were promised that restoration of unauthorized trails was going to be taken care of. Very little has been done on this, we are not even close to taking care of damage that has taken place in the past. We don't have enough funding to take care of the 570 miles of trails we have. I recommend that we raise the annual fee to \$35.00 per person and raise the seven day permit to \$25.00 per person. I encourage the Board to reject the FS recommendation.

Iudicello-Martley: I support the proposal that Colin has put forward and I will vote against the

recommendation of the FS. At the meeting that we first discussed this, Sam, Tom, and others put good ideas on the table in terms of what a business owner would do, how you would respond to a business plan as far as numbers and analysis. I know that some of you had offline discussions, but I haven't been thoroughly satisfied with the kind of response from the managers of the system, about bringing back the information needed to make a decision. If there are future things that we ask for; I'm not really confident that the people on the Board will get what they need next year – or that the users will get what they need to continue the use. I don't know how you can look at these issues and say that we are just going to keep on keeping on – there's a point at which you have to just raise the price.

Brannan: It was good to hear Colin's data because that's what my sense is; that sale of permits is going up and costs are going down, which is to be expected during implementation years. This would indicate the program is most definitely still in implementation phase which might take a couple more years before things settle out. We look at it from a fund year to a fund year. I feel sorry for Craig and Dennis having to operate this way. When you do something as massive as this, you have to look at it long term, up front you should see costs higher at first. I applaud the FS for getting 570 miles operational already. When we get to 700 miles, then there should be scrutinizing to be done, but for now, I will support the motion.

Smith: Mr. Chairman, some of my friends are for it and some of my friends are against it, and I'm sticking with my friends! I think we need to clarify the "unauthorized trails" comment. This Forest was open unless closed; the Forest was open, and since then has been closed. The implication is that there were outlaw riders on unauthorized trails, which is not the case.

Tieszen: Thank you. I certainly appreciate Colin's comments and I too am concerned about the inability to address some of the previous damage and I continue to be concerned about that. I paid attention to what Sam said; we are in the implementation stage of this program. We are still increasing our numbers of users with permits, we are continuing to build the system, and there are a lot of expenses and income things that haven't stabilized. That has me leaning toward thinking that the status quo is appropriate here. We have to address the issues of fulfilling the promises made when we implemented, but I think we would be best served to stay at the same fees we currently have. I'm inclined to support the recommendation.

Blair: I don't totally disagree with Colin, but the problem is you're putting the licensing of an ATV into another Catch 22. Am I going to pay \$35.00 for a trail permit, or will I just license my ATV as a vehicle and ride anywhere I want. I think we would actually bring in less money if we raised the price. I would like to call the question.

Scherrer: Before you call the question, I will recognize Colin because he had his hand up before you called it. I also reserve the right to make my own final comments.

Paterson: I would be disappointed if the question was called without all people getting a chance to comment. Nels was right, we shouldn't refer to it as unauthorized trails, but if it caused damage, it was illegal. I sense the Board going with the status quo. I put eight years of my life into this system and it is failing because we haven't had the guts to do what we need to do and that is make sure the user pays. We all use the Forest and we pay taxes to support that. But the impact the users have on the Forest is significant and at \$25 we cannot sustain the system. We would be keeping the FS behind the 8 ball on being able to sustain the system if we accept this

recommendation; therefore I urge you to reject the recommendation.

Scherrer: Tom has withdrawn his comment to call the question. If any primary members want to weigh in, we will go around the room and make sure everyone has a chance to speak. I'll open it up to members with new information to share.

Hoyt: Colin with the fee schedule that you propose does it then bring revenues and expenses of the motorized trail system into balance?

Paterson: No it doesn't, in order to do that, we would have to raise it to at least \$50.00 a permit, and then we do have to weigh the difference in losing trail permit fees to license plate fees.

Vonk: To Colin's last point, in today's day and age, we have a good record of folks who are buying permits. We do a lot of work that is called "human dimensions". Before we believe, on face value only, that we would gain or lose folks, we need to start talking to the folks that are using the system; and find out what they are willing to put into the system. I will support Hugh's motion, but there is the opportunity to continue to work with the groups to see what they are willing to put into the system.

Heinert: I've been gone for the past couple of months so I'm not sure what you've discussed in the past. I'm hearing what my colleges are saying, what I'm uncomfortable with is that we've for some reason stood the whole process on its head. As I understand it, the issue before us is to accept or reject the recommendation before us. I find it difficult to understand why we have to accept this or reject it. We are here to give the FS advice, not to accept advice from them.

Brannan: I'll take ownership of that Jim. I completely agree with you, our job is to make recommendations to the FS. The request for the FS to make a recommendation to us came from me. I agree with Colin, we have to study the data and we were not getting it. We haven't finished the trail system, we aren't out of the implementation phase and ready to fix trails and do all the restorative things we had hoped to do until then, so I asked the FS to make that recommendation to us; so that was me.

Heinert: Thank you Sam, but that doesn't change anything, I might agree with your assessment, but I'm very uncomfortable of accepting or rejecting a recommendation made by the FS.

Scherrer: Does the fact that this Board also acts as the Recreation Advisory Committee (RAC), does that have any impact on the fact that we are charged with the responsibility to provide the recommendation – since we wear this RAC hat too?

Jaeger: This Board has the authority to act as the RAC, which deals with fees. We needed the Board's approval to implement the fee structure. The Board asked for updates, we came back and said does the Board want any changes in the fee schedule for 2014, because we were too late in the ball game for 2013. If there were any changes for the 2014 fee schedule, this is the Board that would approve that.

There was a lot of discussion; the Board asked us, "What is your bottom line recommendation"?

As Deputy Forest Supervisor, I said leave the fees alone another year. Our recommendation is to leave the fees the same for another year. If there is additional information needed, a Subcommittee may be needed to develop additional recommendations. What I need today is “Does the Board want to leave the fees the same for 2014?”

Heinert: So you are saying that this Board must accept or reject the recommendation today. In the event we do not accept it, what happens?

Scherrer: If the vote is to reject, then we must come up with a fee structure that we recommend.

Blair: One of the confusing issues is this Board, not just me and you, but everyone goes away and I don’t know that there will even be a meeting next month. If we don’t accept a recommendation, then there may not be a tomorrow.

Scherrer: If we don’t come up with something today, the FS will maintain the status quo thru 2014.

Before we vote on this; and I voted on a different issue and was told that I couldn’t vote but after several conversations, it was determined that I can vote, and will. I want to tell you that I’m not pleased that we have insufficient data, and we are voting on a recommendation that holds things the same. I have been deeply involved in this from day one. Having said that, I am sensitive to what Jeff, Hugh and Tom have brought out about what we can do as we move forward. And the FS is very clear that this group wants more data. With that in mind, being a planning kind of guy, when you do what you can do best with the data that you have, that’s all you can do. I’ll vote in support of the motion.

Paterson: We do have data; Ralph presented us with data in the last few meetings. Permit sales data, 2011 data, 2012 data and projections for 2013. Permit sales have gone up, never the less the cost to the Government is still not fiscally sustainable. None of you would run a business like this, so think about what you are asking the FS to do, to run a system without any more money to do it. I urge you to vote no.

Scherrer: I’ll ask folks to raise their right hand, and have Twila and Marie record the vote.

All in favor of the motion to accept the recommendation to sustain the FS motorized trail permit fee as is for 2014, please raise your right hand.

Those in favor of the motion: Heinert, Tieszen, Hoyt, Blair, Thompson, Carrier, Kohlbrand, Smith, Brannan, Scherrer, Vonk. (11)

All opposed to the motion to accept the recommendation to sustain the FS motorized trail permit fee as is for 2014, please raise your right hand.

Those opposed to the motion: Iudicello-Martley, Paterson. (2)

Motion approved 11 to 2. As always, a vote of objection or rejection provides the members of this Board the opportunity to reduce to writing your reason for opposing the motion. If you would like to take advantage of that opportunity, and submit your opinions to me in writing I will

make sure it goes to the folks in the FS. I would like to have those from you in two weeks if possible.

Scherrer: We now have an opportunity to have a discussion and hopefully a motion to ask the FS to come up with something that will be beneficial to the group discussing this in 2014. An example would be that the FS take the recommendations of the Board and investigate additional options.

Iudicello-Martley: I would like to move that the Board request that the FS come back to the Board, by January 2014, with the following: Exploration of obtaining life time permits thru dealers, a developed database that allows them to provide reports on use and purchase, and a plan for either surveying or questioning user groups to explore fee structures for the next round.

Scherrer: Twila will you please read the motion back to the Board?

Scherrer: Thank you, could I have a second to that motion?

Paterson: I second the motion.

Hoyt: I don't understand the third part of the motion.

Iudicello-Martley: I was referring to what Jeff had said about talking to the user groups and finding out what they are willing to put back into the program, etc.

Scherrer: Is there any further discussion?

Hoyt: I think that we have in the past had a very effective Subcommittee to work on this issue, and I think that asking the Board to act as a committee as a whole will be difficult. I would suggest that we reactivate a Subcommittee and ask that they bring their recommendations back to the Board.

Blair: Ev, you took the words right out of my mouth. That is the question I have, can we reactivate a Subcommittee to look at this, because quite honestly, January 2014 is too late, we need to work on this right now along with the other good ideas. And if you remember correctly, when we worked on this with bob Thompson, it was not just a membership of Board members, but also outside individuals. There were seven or eight people that sat and worked for months on this. There are some really good ideas that could be brought forward for when the Board gets reactivated.

Scherrer: The reality is that there are a lot of folks that are here now that won't be here in June. If we say we'll have a subcommittee now, those same folks might not be here in June.

Jaeger: The membership is a topic that is on the agenda today; NFAB member status; but I'll go ahead and touch on it now. The package is in, we had to nominate at least two names in each category, each person filled out the paperwork, and it is in its final stages. Do I expect that we will have a Board in June? Absolutely; but can I say who will be on the Board? No.

Vonk: I agree with the concept of a Subcommittee; but being unable to appoint a Subcommittee

right now, could we agree to make a list of important items that we would leave behind for the new group that starts in June, and they will have our list of items to recommend to the FS. This topic ought to be one of the main items on the list.

Scherrer: We can vote on this motion and the motion will be carried to the new Board members in June.

Heinert: I was going to say that I want to endorse Suzanne's motion. I agree with the motion, but given the concerns, I think it's too narrow – I think the Subcommittee is the broader process. If we have any influence of how the Subcommittee takes on the task. If the goal is that this system is self-supportive, then the objective should be for the Subcommittee to develop a plan for the system to be self-supportive. That plan is what will be going to the FS from the Board.

Iudicello-Martley: I'm not opposed to a Subcommittee. We can, as our last act of the Advisory Board, ask the FS or advise them, to do something. I think that for some of us, with this user fee business is that part of the frustration came from the fact that it wasn't our committee that didn't have the information. I went back and counted and there were five separate requests for information that did not come till Colin went to the FS and dug it out. There is a business plan, and as I go out the door, my motion is that there are some good ideas left on the table, and the answers to the questions are with the managers. The managers have to provide the new Board members with the information they need. My motion is asking that the FS come back with information, we asked and asked and asked and we got shined off.

Paterson: The request for the FS to bring info is important but that is in addition to the formal review of the numbers, costs, revenues, system adequacy, and performance annually that the business plan directs. We need that formally in place, and not for us to have to dig that up after months and months of pursuit.

Brannan: Ev mentioned that this should be sustainable, and we won't vote for one more thing that costs money. We do have the data and the data indicates that we are not out of the implementation phase yet, which is what I sensed. If permit sales are still creeping up and the cost is going down – I doubt if we'll be out of the implementation phase by January. I don't know if the timing will be such that the new Board will be able to decide anything further. I don't have a problem approving the motion as it is, but I hope the new Board uses good business judgment to refrain from increasing permit costs if the program hasn't stabilized into operational mode by then. If it's not a good time in January and we don't have costs and permit sales leveling off by then, there may not be any reason to make any adjustments until further information is available.

Paterson: I think the Board needs first-hand information on the trail system. Part of our field trip in August should be the trail system.

Scherrer: I'm going to ask that we vote on this. It was a multi-part motion; everyone indicated that it was clear to them; Twila has it as part of the record.

Iudicello-Martley: One small thing before we vote please. I've been advised that we should

take the word “dealer” out of the motion, because a “Dealer” is not the only person we may obtain a life time membership from.

Scherrer: So the motion stands as made by Suzanne, less the word “dealer”. All in favor of the motion signify by saying aye; opposed same sign. The motion has been unanimously approved. Thank you for your thoughtful consideration of this issue.

We’ve gone a little long on our time, so the wiggle room we had was the Range presentation; so that might fall off the agenda. Let’s take a short break.

Scherrer: Before we get going, Supervisor Bobzien is going to be leaving, and wanted to make a couple of comments.

Bobzien: My personal thanks to you as Board members. That Wyoming snow fence is a small symbol of being able to work through a variety of things and is indicative of how you all care. I was glad I was here today to hear what you are asking for, and the passion you all have, and your ideas about how we can make it all better. I am confident the Board is going to continue. It is well respected. We will take it one step at a time. We are still learning with the Travel Management Program, and you are advising, which is going to help us. I thank you for that. Case Number 1 was the first timber sale in the nation, and happened right there on the Black Hills National Forest, and we are still learning.

I will not get another chance to thank you all again, for all that you brought individually and as a group, the passion you brought to the Board. Thank you, Mister Chair, for the advice and information that you have provided.

Scherrer: The next item on the agenda is the Pine Beetle Response Project Update – Implementation Focus, which will be provided by Katie Van-Alstyne.

Jaeger: We rolled out the Mountain Pine Beetle Response Project in December. The NFAB asked for a biennial update of implementation. That is what we will be providing today.

Van-Alstyne: Good afternoon. It was a year ago this week that a miner, an environmentalist, a lawyer, and a forester sat down together to review the Mountain Pine Beetle Response Project (PBR). The team provided spectacular comments that helped make this document much stronger. Thank you to the subcommittee and to the Board itself. We signed the Record of Decision (ROD), in December 2012. The Interdisciplinary Team (ITD) has stayed engaged based on their resource areas, helping district staff understand the analysis and the ROD, and providing check lists. The Forest has gone through Rose Petal, Buck Mountain cut and chunk, Buck Mountain Timber Sale, and now Fox Ridge. The ITD is doing surveys if needed, and communicating with specialists to make sure we are following through with the intent of the Decision. Lynn Kolund is going to sign the Fox Ridge Decision today. The areas that we selected for PBR include Fox Ridge, which is a continuation of one of Hell Canyon District’s NEPA documents/decision. Rose Petal and Buck Mountain followed with over all Forest strategy, as with the PBR Working Group.

Kolund: Adding to what Katie said, Fox Ridge is a subdivision that is a Fire Wise community.

The community has been working on the perimeter of their subdivision, piling brush, etc. adjacent to the subdivision. The District was busy accomplishing the planning, and now we are more active in the implementation. We are also planning to look at implementing PBR in some active timber sales that were prepared four or five years ago.

Van-Alstyne: Aside from field guides that specialists are working on, the ITD will be looking at monitoring and fine tuning monitoring guides. They will formulate the documents to help their District counterparts. We hope to have final monitoring guides by August 2013.

Scherrer: That was a good quick update.

Hoyt: Can you provide any numbers for acres treated through PBR?

Van-Alstyne: These current projects are all timber sales, less than 2000 acres total. It is easier to test the strategy on a small project. With Buck Mountain we will be hitting areas that according to Forest Health are areas we need to focus on. We are only five months from the decision being signed.

Small Sales Program Update – Dave Mertz

Scherrer: Since we are talking about Small Sales Program, you will recall that at the March meeting, during the panel discussion, a number of folks at the table talked about the mountain pine beetle strategy. Ev Hoyt had some questions about the Small Sales Program, and Bill Kohlbrand talked about the Program. Ev, can you summarize the questions you have?

Hoyt: When we had the panel discussion, you recall that there was a discussion that a Small Sales Program could be an effective tool for affecting small pockets of mountain pine beetle infestation, and they could be brought to the mill. There has been talk about implementing a Small Sales Program.

Scherrer: Members of the Board wonder if we have an impact on Forest management. Ev Hoyt has led the charge on the Small Sales Program.

Mertz: After the March meeting, I asked Greg McGranahan to come up with list of small sales we have done in this Fiscal Year, as well as other actions we have accomplished. This list is about a month old, but it will give you an idea of what has been accomplished. Small sales are something that we do, and will continue to do. Dennis and I met with Ben Wudtke a couple of weeks ago. We will also be meeting with him again next week and with folks from the Forest Products Industry.

We have done a variety of small scales. Some of the ones Katie talked about are part of the Small Sales Program. From our perspective, unless we can increase our capacity, if you want to maintain the large sale program at capacity, and you want to increase small sales, we need to increase our capacity. As you can understand, there is more work involved in many small sales that add up to one large scale, because of the differences between many contracts versus just one contract. With the capacity we have, it is important to put small sales in the right spot. You can have a real impact if they are placed correctly. The working group can provide input. Those are

some of the considerations. Are we targeting green hit trees with the Small Sales Program? You have to identify where they are going to be. Then you have the time to put the sale together, mark the trees, put the contract together, get it sold and get the trees cut before the beetles have flown. If you do it as a PBR sale, you need to do surveys out there. It could really have an impact, but there are some things to consider. Questions or comments?

Scherrer: What are you doing? I hear the glass is empty all the time. What are we doing? I know there are a lot of meetings going on.

Jaeger: The Conservation Leaders Group is meeting on a regular basis to incorporate the strategy that this Board put together. That group is putting things together. We are doing everything to be in the right place at the right time. Industry wants to remove bug hit trees. The problem is I would rather have large sales under contract and have sanitation completed before they can get in and do the whole thing. The Small Sale Program can reduce our man time, but industry has to be the partner on this. How do we get more efficient with the Small Sale Program? There is Neiman Enterprises and 7-8 smaller operators. They all have their niches of type of wood they are looking for. With the Fire Wise subdivision, we are trying to put a small sale in that area. Can we do something to increase the Small Sales Program? We are meeting with Ben Wudtke to see if we can get in and get the bugs out before we go in and do a cut and chunk. We would rather see the wood go to the mill. I would like to see NFAB members come to a Working Group meeting to see what the group is accomplishing. There is a lot being done. We do have a Small Sales Program. Are we using it as efficiently as possible? No. We are looking at ways to make it work better.

Hoyt: Yes, Ben agreed that you are working together to develop a portfolio of tools to use in this process.

Brenneisen: Dennis just stole my thunder. I wanted to start by saying that the Forest does have a Small Sales Program. There seems to be a perception that the Small Sales Program went away in the 1970s and that we need to resurrect it. That is not the case. The Forest Service still has contracts in place to sell small amounts of timber – different aspects can push sales into those categories, i.e. lack of roads – but the program is there and is being used. Industry saw ways we might be able to tweak this tool and use it more effectively. It tends to be more of a southern hills phenomenon, occurring on the Mystic and Hell Canyon Districts. There are some specific places that we feel the Small Sales Program could be helpful in the northern hills, including Nautilus and Steamboat. The shift you the Forest just did in your five-year plan may have negated the need for that. We are looking for ability to take some of these sales for out years, look at where bug activity is the heaviest, and carve out a unit - maybe in an area that has been marked already - and take out timber, shift the timeline, to buy us a bug flight. That is what Neiman is interested in. Other things - like looping in sanitation only - you guys need to talk with other purchasers, because you do not want to go ahead with a program if there is not any interest. We would like to see more programs in the northern hills, moving some areas out of cut and chunk and into commercial treatments. Our mills are being under-utilized right now. We can sell more blue timber than is coming in. We are looking to keep mills killing bugs. Keep then processing blue stain logs into blue stain lumber at the highest possible rate our salespeople can sell. Every sale resulting in timber sales results in less fuel on the ground. The State is going to be providing money to counties going forward, but if we can implement treatments that result in sales, then counties can focus on outlier areas that are not commercially viable. We had the

Dead Horse and Phoenix sales that the forest put together a year ago, and we used Designation by Damage. We are waiting to see the final report on alternate authorities. These authorities help to address issues. There is an economy of scale when talking about timber. We need to look at alternative authorities. With Dead Horse and Phoenix, I think we could have left the Dead Horse sale, which was scheduled to sell last fall, but the district, at our request, went in and used alternative authority, and grabbed some folks out of sale administration to put together two quick sales. Neiman bought the sale and logged before the bugs flew. We expected the regular Dead Horse sale would go forward as scheduled for treatment as original planned, but it has now been postponed to 2017. We would like to see areas scheduled for treatment in the near future put in small sales, with then a follow up large sale as originally planned.

Scherrer: Is there a way to get some assets moved around to bring them to the attention of the Forest?

Mertz: The Northern Hills District has been a leader in producing timber for the Forest. They have been very busy with large sales. That comes down to capacity. It is a trade-off.

Scherrer: What are the criteria you use for picking small sale areas?

Mertz: As Dennis said, we could be more strategic, more practical. It comes down to what the District Ranger wants to do. Actions might be in response to a landowner who has interest in adjacent Forest Service property.

Scherrer: What is the Forest Service doing to make us safer, given the capacity issues, when it is May 15, and in three months we are going to have another bug flight. I would like to be able to walk out of this meeting, and know what to tell constituents about areas that are not yet impacted by the beetles. Can you give us your goals and plan for action before the next flight, and what are you going to do from September to next March? What are you going to do, and when are you going to do it?

Jaeger: You are looking at something different from just the Small Sales Program. It sounds like you are asking for the accomplishment report from the Working Group, which says what has been accomplished, and what they plan to do in the next year. We have that, but do not have it here today. We can get that to the Board, and schedule it for a meeting agenda item.

Scherrer: I would like the current Board to receive the accomplishment report.

Jaeger: They will receive it.

Kohlbrand: I think the frustration around the Small Sales Program is the timeline required to accomplish the small scale. It seems to take a year to put a small scale together. It is difficult for the public to stomach that, when they drive by the bug trees and cannot do anything with them. That is more difficult than the large sales.

Mertz: We are working on Designation by Damage, Designation by Prescription. But to put something together quick, you have to take energy away from somewhere else. We want to cut green hit trees, and there is a short time-frame to do it, but there are trade-offs. Last year this Forest sold more timber than any other Forest in the USDA Forest Service system. It is amazing

what is being done on this Forest. That is what I would tell people.

Kohlbrand: Is there a way to treat green hit trees and dead trees, since in effect they are dead?

Jaeger: You are right on. It can be done, if we have the NEPA and PBR, and other tactics. It can be done. It is hard to drive by dead trees and wonder why we cannot get their fast enough. Silver City accomplished it quickly, but their treatment was more of a fuels treatment. We have many WUI communities within the Black Hills National Forest.

Scherrer: Scott, do you have something to add? Scott Guffey is in charge of the Pennington County Weed and Pest District which is within the Mystic Ranger District.

Guffey: We are doing a Small Sales Program with Neiman. We wanted to prepare for evacuation near Deerfield, Reno Gulch, Edelweiss, etc. – a total of five areas. We surveyed which trees would drop and Neiman offered to buy those trees. We bought green trees at 50 cents, and dead trees at 13 cents per tree. Loggers accomplished cut and chunk, and Neiman is buying from them. Cut and chunk costs 15 cents per tree. We cut and chunked about 3200 trees at Buck Mountain. We could not get the rest. But as we plan into this fall, we are going to meet with the Forest Service. This is a cheaper way to move forward.

Scherrer: Does this come from the county/FS relationship, or is it part of the PBR Working Group?

Guffey: It comes from our relationship with the Mystic District.

Scherrer: The Forest Service needs to do a better job at public relations. You are accomplishing a lot, but you need to provide information. My view is our group has an opportunity to advise and to support and educate our constituents in the Hills about the positives that are going on in the Forest. The fact is, I am hoping this body can continue to educate. The local population is very uncomfortable. With every fire, everyone worries and wants to know where the fire is located? Are there any questions?

Paterson: Where are the current fires?

Jaeger: The current fires are between 2-5 acres each. The fire near Stockade Lake is a prescribed burn. There is also a prescribed fire at Gobbler Knob. There are two fires in the northern hills that were ignited by lightening last night.

Cave & Abandoned Mine Management for White-Nosed Syndrome Update

Scherrer: The next item on the agenda is the Cave and Abandoned Mine Management Decision.

Jaeger: Kerry Burns is our forest wildlife biologist. As you know, White-Nosed Syndrome (WNS) is a significant threat that has killed many bats. We have had a cave closure in effect since 2010. The Forest Service accomplished a regional environmental analysis, and then each Forest signed its own Record of Decision. I want to thank the sub-committee for their feedback.

Kerry will give you the latest.

Burns: Thank you. I think the Environmental Assessment (EA) was attached to the agenda. It is not very long. You can read it. I will focus on the decision, and how your comments were helpful. I handed out a one sheet synopsis. The EA is complete. The Decision was signed on March 26th, 2013. We are currently in the 45 day appeal period. We did get one appeal. Our goal is to implement the decision on August 1, 2013.

The EA and the ROD are available at:

<http://www.fs.usda.gov/detail/r2/home/?cid=stelprdb5319926>

The decision implements Alternative 2, the proposed action, as described in the EA. It also implements mandatory decontamination procedures for all visitors to all caves, described as an optional strategy in the EA. Optional elements were analyzed as possible management tools under the EA. Any of the optional elements may be selected for implementation after the decision and documented with a note to the project record and appropriate public notice. The ROD describes a three-tiered management approach.

Alternative Two is the adaptive management alternative, with decontamination. There are three tiers, and each has required elements and optional elements. We are still working on criteria for when we would use optional elements.

Tier 1: Caves Open with Targeted Closures

Neither WNS nor the fungus *Geomyces destructans* (Gd) occur within 250 miles of a ranger district boundary (current situation).

Required Elements:

- Prohibit caving gear and clothing used in states or Canadian provinces where WNS is confirmed or suspected.
- Visitor registration system for cave access.
- Seasonal closures for caves that are known hibernacula.
- Year-round decontamination procedures for caves that are known hibernacula.

Optional Elements:

- Decontamination procedures for all caves (selected to be implemented immediately).
- Year-round closures for caves that are known hibernacula.
- Seasonal or year-round closures for swarming sites and maternity sites.
- Decontamination procedures for abandoned mines, where appropriate.

Tier 2: Caves Closed with Targeted Openings

WNS or Gd has been confirmed within 250 miles of a ranger district. Following the confirmation of Gd or WNS, the ranger district falls into tier 2 and implementation will occur as quickly as practicable. The responsible official may add other ranger districts or the entire national forest for management consistency.

Required Elements

- Year-round closures on all caves.

- Decontamination before and after entry for exceptions to closures (listed in below).

Optional Elements

- Targeted cave openings.
- Decontamination procedures for targeted openings.
- Decontamination procedures for AMLs, where appropriate.

Tier 3: Release from Management Activities under Tiers 1 and 2

In tier 3, the management activities in tiers 1 and 2 would no longer apply. Tier 3 would allow management for unexpected behavior of the disease or unanticipated impacts to bats. It addresses the scenario, in which WNS or Gd has been confirmed, but impacts to bat populations are either minimal or undetectable or the disease is considered endemic in the analysis area. Moving to tier 3 requires a re-examination of WNS science and discussion with federal and state wildlife agencies and the regional office. If, once WNS is here and endemic, we will lift this ruling and manage caves according to the current Forest Plan, as we have done for many years. That decision would be made by the Regional Office, because we do not want to be a source for moving WNS further west or to another area.

Exceptions to closures:

The following exceptions would apply in tiers 1 and 2:

- Any federal, state, or local law enforcement officer or member of an organized rescue or firefighting force working in the performance of an official duty.
- Persons operating under the 1872 Mining Law.
- Tribal members wishing to conduct ceremonies, rituals, or other culturally important events.
- Forest Service employees, contractors, and volunteers; personnel from state or federal wild-life agencies; or other permitted persons conducting official business, as authorized by the forest supervisor.
- Persons conducting research, inventory, or monitoring as needed to understand or manage WNS and contribute to the nomination of cave resources as significant under the FCRPA (16 U.S.C. 4301 – 4309 and 36 C.F.R.290), as authorized by the forest supervisor.
- Members of the NSS or CRF conducting activities consistent with the national memoranda of understanding (MOU) between the Forest Service and these caving organizations, as authorized by the forest supervisor.

Other Considerations

- Show caves, such as Wonderland cave, would be addressed individually through permit conditions or other mechanisms, as appropriate. Some management activities described above may be appropriate for show caves, but they would be evaluated individually during the permitting process.

With abandoned mines we are using the approach of “Stay out and stay alive.”

We will be pretty critical about entering hibernacula in winter. We will try to avoid winter season activity in hibernacula.

As of August 1st, we hope to open caves, with the exception of hibernacula. Decontamination practices are becoming more common, as with boats, and decontamination may be our best defense against the spread of WNS.

The NFAB Board feedback was helpful. The EA was a regional assessment. Your comments played a critical role. A lot of what you brought up set the tone and philosophy for trigger points. You gave them a lot to work with and consider. The overall goal to reduce contamination and risk while allowing recreational activity was achieved. There was a lot of feedback on education, and there is a long way to go but the registration and permit process will help. We are working with the caving groups, and we are recommending decontamination, which is a very positive thing we could do to keep WNS out of the caves. The Board's input for a 3 tier approach, registration process, application process, and strict decontamination process, all got incorporated into the final decision. Last week we received an appeal on the Decisions, from five groups, that will be dealt with at the Regional Office. We will have to see what happens with that. We are going forward with our working group, working with the regional office, so that we will be ready by July 31st.

Are there any questions?

Paterson: What is the NPS doing about their public caves, and what about private caves?

Burns: The National Park Service folks at Jewel Cave are still allowing visitors. Their bats are a long way away from where their visitors go. Mammoth Cave has established a decontamination walkway. Visitors entering the cave are provided a wardrobe of coveralls, which are then laundered. Private caves – that gets into the educational part of it. This is an issue, and decontamination is probably the easiest and cheapest thing you can do.

Thompson: Has this gotten into Carlsbad yet?

Burns: I think the farthest west it has gotten is Missouri – eastern Missouri. And they found WNS in western Iowa. It was in a State cave - they found the fungus, but did not confirm illness.

Hutt: Can you briefly discuss the basis of the appeal?

Burns: I can hit the big points. Basically, the appeal is taking issue with the 250 miles they think was arbitrary and capricious. I do not know what the criteria were for establishing that. They want the Forest Service to do an Environmental Impact Statement to evaluate impacts. They claim that the Forest Service did not follow NEPA and did not address the Purpose and Need of the NEPA process.

Scherrer: Any other questions?

Burns: Because we are in a time of closure, allowing people back in does not reduce the risk of the syndrome occurring in this area. It is a pretty well written appeal.

Thank you for your input. I think it set the tone for structuring the three tier system. We appreciate all the work.

Scherrer: Thank you to the members of the subcommittee, and to all the members of the Board who voted on the recommendations forwarded by the subcommittee.

Carrier: I want to thank Suzanne and Becci for helping with the writing, and to Kerry and Brad Phillips.

BHNF Range Program Overview ~ Craig Beckner

Scherrer: Craig has had a medical issue to deal with, so we are going to cancel the range overview.

National Forest Advisory Board Membership Update ~ Scott Jacobson

Scherrer: The next item on the agenda that I think everyone needs to hear is an update on the nomination process for members for the NFAB. Scott and I talked at ten this morning. Scott, could you give us an update.

Jacobson: The nomination package has been submitted and is moving through the channels in Washington. I was assured that we should plan on our June meeting. Jim and I also talked about the Charter status. The current Charter is effective through February 2014. Looking forward to June, we should have new members in place, with short notice. We will do everything to give notice to new members.

Scherrer: The next meeting is scheduled for June 19th. If you are extending, please put on your calendar June 19th. If there is no information provided regarding approval of new members, Scott will notify everyone. Everyone else, this is it with regard to our work. Thank you for your time, attention, and passion.

Thompson: Will you release a news release about appointments? There are some issues regarding who will be appointed primary and alternate.

Scherrer: I think a news release is a good idea

Paterson: You will notify everyone who applied?

Scott: Yes.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Scherrer: Please identify yourself for the record.

Zimmerman: My name is Mary Zimmerman. I just wanted to express my disappointment with implementation of the Travel Plan. At this point we are not economically sustainable, and I wonder when we can expect to be economically sustainable. At what point will you raise the fees or make the system smaller so that what is coming into support it will be congruent with what we are trying to accomplish. We need to understand the economics. I think we need to reconcile that.

Thompson: There is no legal mandate for the ATV trail system to be financially sustainable. We have many programs that are not financially sustainable.

Zimmerman: Is that really practical? We need the Black Hills to be sustainable. There is a concept of overshoot when you will not have any resource left.

Scherrer: Make sure the attention you and others have brought regarding this issue, continues with the new Board. My take away, is that this group is not going to sit back forever. The point is that it is important for the public to be involved. You have been to almost every meeting. You and Patty have been involved and have come to many meetings.

Paterson: Whatever we have to spend on Travel Management takes away from MPB, range management. As a staunch tea partier, I am surprised at how the Forest has addressed this issue.

Scherrer: If there are no additional comments, do I have a motion to adjourn the meeting?

Thompson: I so move.

Paterson: I second the motion.

Scherrer: All in favor signify by saying “aye.” The motion passed unanimously.

Next Meeting is scheduled for June 19, 2013.